

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANDREW J. ARRINGTON, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 14-885
)	
ERNESTINE McRAE, <i>et al.</i> ,)	Judge Cathy Bissoon
)	
Defendants,)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Diane I. Arrington has filed a letter addressed to the Court, in which she seeks “reconsideration from [the Court’s] previous decision.” Doc. 6 at 5. The Court will construe Plaintiff’s letter as a Motion for Reconsideration of this Court’s July 10, 2014 Order (Doc. 3) dismissing this action with prejudice.¹ For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration will be denied.

A proper motion for reconsideration “must rely on one of three grounds: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; or (3) the need to correct clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” Lazaridis v. Wehmer, 591 F.3d 666, 669 (3d Cir. 2010) (citing N. River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)). To the extent that the Court understands the contents of her disjointed letter, Plaintiff has not identified any intervening change in controlling law or any new evidence nor has she demonstrated a need to correct a clear error of law. Rather, it appears that she implores the Court to prevent manifest injustice related to various persons and institutions Plaintiff feels are targeting her and/or her family.

¹ This is Plaintiff’s second Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s July 10, 2014 Order. Plaintiff filed a “Letter of Reconsideration” on April 14, 2016 (Doc. 4), which this Court denied on April 27, 2016 (Doc. 5).

(Doc 6 at 5) (“[W]e are being subjected to a series of generational fraudulent misrepresentations from identity thefts, profiling, targeting, black listings, eminent domain, and our basic civil rights violated without due process.”). For the jurisdictional reasons stated in the Court’s July 10, 2014 Order, the Court is not in a position to grant Plaintiff’s motion. Accordingly, there is no basis for reconsideration, and Plaintiff’s motion is denied.

The Court will return to Plaintiff via certified mail the original documents filed with her letter, including the Arrington Family Photo cover sheet (Doc 6-1), a check in the sum of \$500.00 (Doc 6-2), and the Family Photo (Doc 6-3). To the extent that Plaintiff intends to state a new cause of action through her letter, she is free to do so in a new lawsuit. The Court does not express any opinion as to whether such a lawsuit would be successful.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

September 28, 2016

s/Cathy Bissoon
Cathy Bissoon
United States District Judge

cc (via ECF email notification):

All counsel of record

cc (via Certified Mail):

ANDREW J. ARRINGTON, SR.
DIANE I. ARRINGTON
1247 Hillsdale Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15216